



ecology and environment, inc.

108 SOUTH WASHINGTON, SUITE 302, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104, TEL. 206-624-9537

International Specialists in the Environment

5. mead 1D 0961
2.9.86

7a

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: February 9, 1986

TO: Richard Fullner, TATL, E&E, Seattle

FROM: William Carberry, ATATL, E&E, Seattle *WLC*

SUBJ: Trip Report: ARRCOM Oil Recycling Facility

REF: TDD T10-8701-006

Place Visited:

ARRCOM Oil Recycling Facility
Highway 53
Kootena County, Idaho

Persons Making Trip:

William Carberry, ATATL, E&E, Seattle,
Carl Kitz, TAT-DPO, SREC, USEPA, Region 10, Seattle

Person's Contacted:

The site was abandoned, so there was no one associated with the site to talk to. Idaho EPA was informed by SREC of our visit, but did not send a representative.

Date of Trip:

February 3, 1987 10:15 am to 11:30 am

Purpose of Trip:

To conduct a site assessment of the abandoned ARRCOM oil recycling facility and determine if additional effort will be required at the site.

Remarks:

On February 3, 1987, I accompanied Carl Kitz, TAT-DPO, on a site assessment of the abandoned ARRCOM oil recycling facility, located on Highway 53, approximately 2 miles east of Rathdrum, Idaho. The assessment was conducted in response to citizen complaints that tanks at the facility were leaking.

According to SREC, the ARRCOM facility was the subject of an EPA remedial project in the early 1980s. There are approximately 15 tanks of varying sizes on-site. During the remedial activity, all of the tanks were reportedly drained of

REMOVAL

USEPA RCRA



3009410

standing oil, however sludges were left in each tank. Most of the valves were removed and plugged. There was a limited amount of on-site soil excavation and removal. Recently the USEPA has received complaints that one or more of the tanks have begun to leak. The oil in one of the larger tanks was reportedly contaminated with PCBs.

We arrived on-site at 10:15 AM on the morning of February 3, 1987. The weather was overcast and there were occasional snow showers. There were four to six inches of snow on the ground at the site.

The site covers approximately one acre, with the entrance located on the western edge of the site, off Highway 53. A dirt road encircles the 15 or so ARRCOM storage tanks and abandoned processing buildings. There was no evidence of recent vehicular activity at the site, as the dirt road through the facility was overgrown with weeds.

Within minutes after our arrival on-site, two dogs appeared on the eastern edge of the facility. After a few minutes of barking, the dogs approached us aggressively, and remained next to the car, making it impossible for us to conduct a close inspection of the tanks. We later determined that the dogs belonged to the neighbor on the south side of the facility.

After driving through the facility, we went to Rathdrum to see if local officials had received any complaints on the site. The Chief of Police for Rathdrum indicated that he had heard that there had been some recent local concern about the facility, but could not recall any specifics, and had no complaints on official record. The chief informed us that the facility was in county jurisdiction, and that the county sheriff would be the one to get police complaints. He then called the county sheriff's office, who also had not received any recent complaints against the facility. Also, he checked with the sheriff's office and determined that the county animal control officer had commitments at the other end of the county, and would not be available to assist us with the dogs.

The city hall receptionist told us that she drove by the site every day on her way home, and when there was no snow on the ground, the site emitted a strong odor. This situation began about a year and a half ago, and has been getting worse. Since the snows have fallen, she hasn't notice the odors.

We decided to check the odor allegations with other neighbors. No one was home at the closest residence, located approximately 300 yards to the south of the facility, but we did determine that this is the likely residence of the two dogs that had been bothering us. The only other close residence was located approximately the same distance to the west of the facility. The woman at this house indicated that she had not

noticed any unusual odors or other unusual circumstances or conditions at the facility.

Upon returning to the site, we had only a few minutes outside the car before the dogs returned, and were again unable to conduct a close inspection of the tanks. While outside the car, however, I did notice an oily odor.

Conclusion:

After discussing our observations during the site visit, Carl Kitz indicated that a second site assessment visit will be necessary after the snow melts, and that no further activity will be required until that next trip is planned.